

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

COUNCIL OF THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

Minutes of the meeting held on Friday, February 4, 1983

Present: M. Singer, Chairman, R. Breen, D. Taddeo, J. Chaikelson, R. Roy, J. Princz, C. Foster, T. Arbuckle-Maag, C. Bertrand, K. Bindon, A. Broes, D. Dicks, R. Diubaldo, J. Doyle, C. Kalman, B. Lewis, M. Oppenheim, F. MacLeod, S. McEvenue, D. McDougall, R. Pallen, B. Petrie, H. Proppe, K. Riener, A. Ross, J. Ryan, B. Sahni, L. Sanders, M. Squires, M. Taylor, G. Trudel, J. Young, A. Okwudi, A. Megann, L. Keays, G. Laurence, P. Gott, J. Griffin.

Absent with Regrets: A. Galler, K. Kusano, U. Comtois, H. Shulman, G. Taggart, A.M. Ketter, G. Newsham.

Guests: R. Smith (T.E.S.L.), L. Van Toch, J. Drysdale.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:40 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

83-2-1 It was moved and seconded (Roy/Squires) to approve the agenda as circulated.
Vote: Carried

Closed Session

Open Session

4. Chairman's Remarks

In reporting on the Senate meeting which was held on January 28th, Provost Singer said that Dean Taddeo had given an excellent statement on his personal interpretation of the Phase II Report. However, a procedural wrangle had prevented further meaningful discussion.

The Chairman informed the members of Council that the report on the Senate meeting that appeared in the Thursday Report was erroneous. In fact, Senate lost quorum only after it had been decided that the discussion of the Phase II document was concluded for that meeting. However, the student "walk-out" did prevent discussion of a proposal regarding the Computer Committee.

5. Questions and Announcements

Provost Singer explained course scheduling procedures in answer to a question on the number of sections offered in a particular course in Women's Studies.

Prof. McEvenue asked if Dean Taddeo would be willing to report the statement he had made at Senate at this meeting. It was agreed that he could do so when Item 7 on the agenda was reached.

Provost Singer reported that it had been impossible for him to convene a meeting of the Faculty Appeal Committee. He explained that it was his duty, as Chairman of Council, to convene a meeting of the Appeal Committee in order to have them select a chairman. He said that he had tried on three successive occasions to set a meeting but had been unable to get a quorum. He had, therefore, followed a different procedure, because he had been told that it was the wish of some of the members to have Prof. Gray re-appointed chairman. A telephone poll was conducted and it was found that a consensus had been reached in the committee. Prof. Singer asked for, and received, Council's acceptances of this means of having the chairman of the committee selected. He will approach Prof. Gray to ask him if he is willing to accept the chairmanship.

6. Elections

a) Arts and Science Faculty Panel (Regulations Regarding Cheating, Undergraduate)

Provost Singer reported that through the efforts of Mr. Griffin the full student complement on the Faculty Panel had been filled. He read the list of members.

83-2-3 It was moved and seconded (Pallen/Doyle) to confirm the appointment of Theresa Maioni, Robert Lachance, Rhonda Stoller, James Griffin, Deborah Konig and Scott Ferguson to the Faculty Appeal Committee.
Vote: Carried

b) Arts and Science Committee on Registration and Course Change

83-2-4 It was moved and seconded (Griffin/Okwudi) to approve the appointment of Perry Rapagna to the Arts and Science Committee on Registration and Course Change.
Vote: Carried

7. Looking to the Future - Phase II Report of the University Mission Study (seventh session)

The chairman reminded the members of Council that at the last meeting it had been determined that the Steering Committee would structure a debate on the Phase II Report based on the results of the discussion that had taken place at that meeting. He said that the Steering Committee had met on two different occasions and had prepared some documentation (ASFC 82-2-D1) for this meeting. He then explained how the committee had proceeded in the preparation of the document.

Prof. McEvenue asked to have a discussion on space and on the section of the document starting with the last paragraph on page 6. The Chairman suggested that item (7) of ASFC 83-2-D1 be expanded to include that paragraph.

It was agreed that the debate proceed with a discussion on the five points.

Prof. Doyle made a comparison between the "Preamble" and the "Opportunities". He suggested that it might be said that the general drift of the "Opportunities" is that by these means we may obtain and perhaps retain the largest possible number of students whereas the "Preamble" bears upon what might be done with or for those students. If the attention of Council was simply directed to the means of increasing enrolments it would be likely that the substance of the discussion would be lost.

Dean Taddeo was invited to repeat the statement he made at the Senate meeting on January 28th. The text of his statement follows:

"In all honesty, I am not an ardent reader of the Minutes of previous Senate meetings. In the light of the debate, or non-debate, which took place in this body concerning the Fahey Committee Report, and especially in the light of the official and unofficial reactions which have been forthcoming to the Phase II University Mission Study Report, I decided to review more closely the Minutes of the November 26, 1982 meeting of Senate.

As I had recalled it, nothing of substance emanated from that meeting and my re-read of the Minutes confirmed my recollection. There were, perhaps, several reasons for this. Student representatives were dissatisfied because they felt they had been excluded from the process. The four academic Faculties each responded to the Fahey Committee report and indeed,

to the Phase I report, from their particular perspectives. It could be too that since there existed no clear identification of priorities and the means by which these priorities would be implemented, no one felt particularly threatened - hence the low decibel volume of reaction. Full-time faculty were more concerned with an interim salary settlement in late November, than in long-term planning. This too, may have been a contributing factor.

I mention this, Mr. Chairman, because I feel that we find ourselves in an analogous situation today. Student response to the Phase II report is, to put it mildly, negative. Those Faculties which have discussed it seem to be in search of a clear, action-oriented document.

Permit me to present to Senate my analysis of the situation and to give my interpretation of the Phase II report. Lest anyone misinterpret my intervention, this is not intended as an Apologia pro Labore suo. I speak not as a member of the Phase II Steering Committee nor as Dean of Division I in the Faculty of Arts and Science. I speak rather as a member of Senate, a product of one of Concordia's two founding institutions, who believes that this University has a vital role to play in the Quebec of tomorrow and who believes also that the more firmly Concordia University decides which course of action to follow, the more secure will be its position as an integral part of Montreal's and Quebec's University reseau - provided, obviously, the course of action we decide to follow is the right one.

Phase I identified eight possible opportunities for this University. These were defined subsequent to consultation with various constituents of the outside community and some members of the University Community. We could question, legitimately, the representativity of those interviewed. Be that as it may, the University decided to move from Phase I to Phase II. As I understand it, Phase II was to synthesize those elements of the eight opportunities which seemed appropriate for Concordia University and if there was a need, to provide opportunities which had not been identified previously. Subsequent to Phase II, a final mission for Concordia would be determined and mechanisms would be established to assure that planning and resource allocation would be coherent and consistent with this mission for the future.

I have the distinct impression that the Phase II Report has not succeeded in this respect. To quote a few of the comments which I have heard - first-hand and second-hand - 'It is a motherhood statement'; 'It is pie in the sky'; 'It offers no direction'; 'It is not action oriented'. I could venture a guess at what the reaction would have been had the Phase II report been 'A fatherhood statement'; 'Down to earth'; 'Directed' and 'Action oriented' - but I will leave that to the months to come.

As I see it, Mr. Chairman, the Phase II report does provide the following elements which were not present in the Phase I report: it makes a statement concerning the philosophy of education, essential to any 'academic' University; it identifies three opportunities which build upon our acquired reputation in the Montreal and Quebec communities. What is missing, is a context for the discussion of these opportunities. With your permission, I would like to attempt to provide a context which could make each one of the opportunities more meaningful and perhaps contribute to today's discussion.

Where does Concordia stand in the University system in Quebec? A study conducted by the Direction Général de l'enseignement et de la recherche universitaires on the University system in Montreal was tabled last spring, more specifically in March 1982. This comparative study of Montreal's four universities provided an analysis of each institution's major characteristics. It is not my intention to review today each one of those elements. I would simply like to provide the highlights concerning Concordia University.

The Ministry of Education Document defines Concordia University as a 'Université à vocation générale d'enseignement et de recherche, offrant des programmes d'enseignement dans de nombreux secteurs académiques, sauf la médecine et le droit'. According to 1979/1980 data, we rank third in student population behind l'Université de Montréal and just behind McGill. We were at that time the least costly University in Montreal, with 22.5% of the city's University population and only 13.4% of budgets given to Montreal universities. We were, in 1979, very accessible, accepting 67% of all applications compared to a 50% acceptance rate in the réseau; 62% of students applying to quota programmes were accepted as opposed to 40% in the réseau; 44% of our students were in quota programmes versus 41% for the réseau. We offered, at that time, by far the largest number of undergraduate programmes in comparison to other universities - yet - our bank of courses was equivalent to the other universities (26 courses per 100 students); in absolute numbers, this bank of courses was inferior by 15% to McGill's and by 25% to the Université de Montréal's. Five percent of our total expenditures were directed towards research compared to an average 15% for the other Montreal universities. Concomitantly, funded research at Concordia in 1979/1980 was on a par with UQUAM but significantly inferior to l'Université de Montréal and McGill, even when we compare only disciplines common to these universities. Sixty-seven percent of our professors possessed the Ph.D. compared to 60% for the Montreal réseau; we had 38 full-time faculty per 1000 students, whereas other Montreal universities had 48.6 full-time faculty per 1000 students; we had 6.1 part-time faculty per 1000 students while the others had 12 per 1000 students. When it comes to space, during the 1980-1981 academic year, based on a ratio of inventoried space over space norms, l'Université de Montréal was 1.02 above the norm; UQUAM was 1.14; McGill 1.14; Concordia was .83. Taken together, the ratio for the French réseau on the Island of Montreal was 1.057; for the English réseau, it was 1.022. Finally, according to the demographic hypothesis retained by the Ministry, the enrolment in French universities is expected to decline from 41,594 NFTs in

1979/1980 to 40,164 NFTs by 2001/2002, whereas in the English universities, it is expected to go from 36,388 to 30,244 NFTs by 2001/2002; this represents a decline of 3% in the former and 17% in the latter. The Ministry emphasizes the fact that in 1979/1980 in Montreal's English universities, the demographic/linguistic composition was as follows: 17.7% non-Quebec residents and, from among the 82.3% students residing in Quebec, 50.7% were anglophone, 17.5% were francophone and 14.1% were allophone. The concluding remark is: 'On peut constater que seulement la moitié des clientèles des universités anglaises sont composés d'anglo-quebécois'. What will be the situation in the year 2001/2002? Given the latest reports from the 1981 census to the effect that Quebec's non-francophone population will be reduced to 15% of the total population by the year 2000, perhaps the Ministry's forecast of a 17% decline in English universities was optimistic!

So much for the data. Are there not questions of a broader scope which we should keep in mind in reviewing the five opportunities? More specifically, are there not questions which any English-speaking public institution ought to keep in mind as it plans for its future in Quebec? I can think of at least three such questions and I shall make them as explicit as possible.

1. What will Concordia's constituency be in 2001/2002, as compared to the constituency of McGill, UQUAM and l'Université de Montréal?
2. What role will Concordia play in the Montreal and Quebec communities in 2001/2002, as compared to McGill, UQUAM and l'Université de Montréal?
3. What will so distinguish Concordia and McGill in 2001/2002 that will enable a society which is composed 85% of French-Canadians to justify support for two major English-language universities in the City of Montreal - within a stone's throw the one from the other?

It is in the light of all the above that we ought to begin to study the five opportunities. It is in light, also, of our current situation that we ought to review the opportunities and develop certain scenarios. With all of these elements in mind, I believe we can ask legitimate questions and provide concrete answers to the options inherent in each one of the opportunities. Again, I would like to pose some concrete questions to three of the opportunities:

Opportunity I:

- a) Is it politically wise to attract more Francophones since the Ministry has signalled already that our population will be less than 50% English-speaking in a few years?
- b) Should we perhaps attempt to gain a greater share of the English-speaking CEGEP graduates?
- c) How do we deal with the demand for our quota programmes from the anglophone and francophone communities? All things being equal, should one be given priority over the other?
- d) Shall we allocate resources primarily to disciplines attracting francophone students?
- e) Shall we allocate resources '... to enable students to acquire a working proficiency in English and French'?

Opportunity III:

- a) Notwithstanding the fact that the English universities in Montreal, according to the Ministry, are .022 above the space norms, it is evident that Concordia University needs additional space. Within the context of Concordia University as a two-campus operation, how could we best use our space in order to make maximum use of these two distinctive settings?
- b) If we consider the Loyola campus to be an asset, should we not ask Faculties other than Arts and Science to play an active role on that campus? Presuming that the great demand for our Faculty of Commerce and Administration lies in its reputation rather than its location, should we not move the thrust of that operation to the Loyola campus? Concurrently, could we not move the thrust of the Computer Science component of the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science to Loyola, given its natural links not only with Commerce and Administration, but indeed to all of higher education, so that that Faculty would also have a presence on both campuses?
- c) Given the technological revolution we are experiencing as a result of the computer, should we not reconsider seriously the role of the library in the university of the future - and make a clear differentiation between study space and information access and retrieval?

- d) Have we determined to make our physical resources community resources as well, and how is that reflected in our planning?

Opportunity V:

- a) Given our track record in research, compared to other Montreal universities, to what extent should we increase resource allocation in this area?
- b) Assured that the criteria would do justice to the very different kinds of research conducted at this university, should we then allocate resources to areas with recognized research expertise? What provisions should we make to allow areas that are 'teaching-intensive' to develop also their research capabilities?
- c) Given our commitment '... to exploit opportunities that reflect the economic, social and technological priorities of government and industry in Quebec and Canada, particularly in areas of high technology,' and '... to expand the number of graduate students 3% to 5% a year - primarily in programs related to employment opportunities - subject to government initiatives affecting Quebec - wide goals' and mindful of our efforts to service better Montreal's Anglophone and Francophone communities, should we then allocate resources to those graduate programs only where at least 80% of the constituency is composed of native anglophones and francophones?

Mr. Chairman, I believe we have in these opportunities matter for debate. As I have indicated, many questions can be asked - what is needed are concrete answers. I believe it is imperative that we review the opportunities seriously so as to arrive at a clear image of what Concordia University will be in the year 2001/2002 and so as to ensure that its distinctiveness, in every aspect, will allow for its continued contribution to the Montreal and Quebec communities - a contribution which I firmly believe is essential to the very fabric of our society.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I have one request to make of this body and of the members of our University community. Differences

of opinion obviously exist, and in some cases, very strong differences of opinion. Too often in the past year these sentiments have been dictated towards individuals rather than toward issues. If so partisan a forum as parliament can ensure that issues, rather than personalities, are debated, then one can hope for the same modicum of behaviour in so sophisticated and serene a forum as academia.

To quote Sallust - *Tantum modo incepto opus esse; cetera res expedit.*"

Recommendation (1) Education for the Entire Community

83-2-5

It was moved and seconded (Megann/Ryan) that Council express its support for the first element of Concordia's mission as expressed in the Phase II Report.

Vice-Rector Breen questioned the effect of voting in favour of the recommendation saying that the registration of French-speaking students is limited to a few quota areas such as Communication Studies, a department that accepts only 100 of the 500 applicants it receives each year, and where approximately 45% of those accepted are French Canadian. In Fine Arts approximately 60% are French Canadian, whereas in other areas (Humanities, Natural Sciences, Engineering) the percentage of francophones is much lower. The percentage of students who graduated from CEGEP's and were admitted to Arts and Science last September, and in January, was just 12%; in Science it was 8% while in Fine Arts it was 40%. Dr. Breen said he could not see the percentage of francophone students increasing beyond 25% unless the quotas are lifted in the high-demand areas, or unless an active campaign is launched to deliberately attract more students from the francophone sector.

Ms. Megann questioned the validity of the statistics given in the report and thought that Council should be provided with more information. Dean Taddeo suggested that the statistics might have been taken from the DGES document issued last March. The Chairman noted that there were more variables which were not built into the statistics such as the mature student population, and of course the influence of the present economic situation. He said he would try to find out the answer to that question if Council so wished.

Ms. Megann replied that her main objection was that the source of the statistics had not been foot noted in the document.

Dean Roy noted that until recent years only one percent of graduates from anglophone CEGEP's have attended francophone universities, but that is now changing. Many students are bilingual and interested in acquiring a functional level bilingualism and therefore are more inclined to study their particular subject in French. He thought that a statement should be made about the feasibility and desirability of offering more courses in French. It would be attractive to some anglophone students and it would ease francophone students into the system.

Mr. Gott suggested three reasons why francophone students come to Concordia: we offer programmes which are not available elsewhere; our programmes are better; and francophone students want to learn English.

Dean Chaikleson thought that Mr. Gott's interjection was important and recalled that when sections of some courses were offered in French, some years ago, they were not popular. They were taken by some anglophones but by no francophones. She shared Vice-Rector Breen's concerns.

Prof. Taylor suggested that a survey be made of the changing pattern of the student population at Concordia. She supported Dean Roy's statement.

Dean Taddeo compared the statistics on incoming students for 1979 to 1982. In 1979, 66% of the population in first year was from Quebec while in 1982 it was 76%. Concordia's share from English CEGEP's has gone from 39% to 47%. Canadians from outside Quebec has remained at 20% while foreign student population has dropped from 13% in 1979 to 12%. In trying to attract students from the francophone area he thought that we should be conscious of what has happened over the last four years and the cost implications for the first opportunity.

Prof. Oppenheim was troubled by the vagueness of the report and said that it was impossible to know the consequences of voting for or against it. Prof. Maag was in agreement.

83-2-6 It was moved and seconded (McEvenue/Taddeo) to amend the second sentence of element 1 to, "Keeping in mind our fundamental commitment to provide quality education for the anglophone community, the fact remains that the face of Montreal is changing."; to delete the next two sentences; to change the next sentence to read, "Concordia's response to this reality is to do whatever is necessary to create an appropriate environment that is linguistically and culturally sensitive to the cultural structures of Quebec.

Dean Chaikelson prefaced the reading of her motion by saying that she would like to have the two goals which she would propose, as part of her motion, voted on separately, as well as any others which might come from the floor of Council, before the main motion was put to a vote. It was so agreed.

83-2-7 It was moved and seconded (Chaikelson/Ryan) that the Arts and Science Faculty Council expresses its support in principle for the first element of Concordia's mission as described in the Phase II Report and would like to see it developed in light of the following specific goals:

- 33-2-8 a) a more active recruitment programme in the French milieu especially with regard to our graduate programme; Vote: Defeated
- 33-2-9 b) teaching some sections of courses in French so that anglophones will have an opportunity to learn the terminology of their disciplines in French; Vote: Carried
- 33-2-10 c) (Maag/Taddeo) making a greater effort to co-operate with other Quebec universities at the level of research and the training of graduates; Vote: Carried
- 33-2-11 d) (Dicks/Maag) making a greater effort to accommodate francophone students in adapting to an anglophone university by providing the necessary infrastructure. Vote: Carried

The main motion as amended was voted on and it was carried.

Recommendation (2) Innovation in Higher Education

- 83-3-10 It was moved and seconded (Ryan/Trudel) that Council expresses its support for the second element of Concordia's mission as described in the Phase II Report.

Recommendation (3) Personal Education in Two Distinctive Settings

- 83-2-11 It was moved and seconded (Trudel/Sahni) that Council support the third element of Concordia's mission as expressed in the Phase II Report with the following modifications:

- a) that at the Faculty level, a committee be established to look at methods to achieve a distinctive role for each of our two campuses;
- b) that Council recommends to the Board of Governors the creation of a university-wide committee to study the optimal use of both campuses.

Dean Chaikelson stated that she was completely opposed to having Council recommend that another committee be established for the University.

With the consent of Council, Prof. Maag read a statement on her rationale for the differentiation of the two campuses in terms of location of the two professional Faculties, Commerce, and Engineering, (ASFC 82-2-D3) as a preamble to her motion:

- 83-2-12 In order to maintain a two-campus operation that maximizes the potential of each campus to attract different groups of prospective students, the Faculty of Commerce be consolidated on the Loyola Campus and the Faculty of Engineering on the Sir George Williams Campus.

Rather than have the motion seconded, immediately, Prof. Maag said she would prefer to hear the reaction of Council to her proposal.

Dean Taddeo asked Prof. Maag if she had considered the feasibility of moving Computer Science to Loyola. Prof. Maag replied by expanding her statement to include Computer Science.

Dr. Breen said he would like to alter the last few lines of the fourth paragraph starting with "this could be accomplished by building a new building for Commerce at Loyola, or possibly by moving the offices and services currently housed in the Administration Building to other quarters on the Campus." He suggested that very inexpensive rental space for the service operations could be planned off-campus. Prof. Maag agreed with the Vice-Rector.

Prof. Sahni moved to amend the motion on the third element to "that Council supports the third element with the following modifications:

- a) that Council recommends to the Board of Governors the specific recommendations (outlined in the enclosed memorandum) towards the optimum use of both campuses;

- b) that at the Faculty level a committee be established to look at methods to achieve its distinctive role on both campuses."

Dean Chaikelson thought that there was need for an integrated motion to take into account what Dean Taddeo had raised concerning Computer Science and the rationale and motion presented by Prof. Maag. In order to allow time for that to be done Dean Chaikelson called for a quorum count. There was a quorum present.

Vice-Rector Breen suggested that the matter be tabled until the next meeting in order to provide the time necessary to have the document reviewed.

Adjournment

It was moved and seconded (Ryan/Chaikelson) the adjourn the meeting.
Vote: Carried

The next meeting was set for Friday, February 11, 1983.